On $1/Z$ expansion, the critical charge for a two-electron system and the Kato theorem

A.V. Turbiner* and J.C. Lopez Vieyra†

Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,

Apartado Postal 70-543, 04510 México, D.F., Mexico

arXiv:1405.5256v3 [quant-ph] 2 Jun 2015

Abstract

The $1/Z$-expansion for the ground state energy of the Coulomb system of an infinitely massive center of charge Z and two electrons (two electron ionic sequence) is studied. A critical analysis of the $1/Z$ coefficients presented in Baker et al, *Phys. Rev.* **A41**, 1247 (1990) is performed and its numerical deficiency is indicated, leading, in particular, to unreliable decimal digits beyond digits 11-12 of the first coefficients. We made a consistency check of the $1/Z$-expansion with accurate energies for $Z = 1 - 10$: the weighted partial sums of the $1/Z$-expansion with Baker et al. coefficients, reproduce systematically the ground state energies of two-electron ions with $Z \geq 2$ up to 12 decimal digits and for $Z = 1$ up to 10 decimal digits. This rules out the presence of non-analytic terms at $Z = \infty$ contributing into the first 10-12 decimal digits in the ground state energy; it agrees with the Kato theorem about convergence of the $1/Z$-expansion within that accuracy. The ground state energy of two-electron ions $Z = 11$ (Na^{9+}) and $Z = 12$ (Mg^{10+}) is calculated with 12 decimal digits.

May 31, 2015

*Electronic address: turbiner@nucleares.unam.mx

†Electronic address: vieyra@nucleares.unam.mx

A two electron system with an infinitely-massive charge center Z is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} \;=\; -\frac{1}{2}(\Delta_1+\Delta_2) \;-\; \frac{Z}{r_1} \;-\; \frac{Z}{r_2} \;+\; \frac{1}{r_{12}}\;. \tag{1}$$

A change of variables in (1), $\vec{r}\to\vec{r}/Z$, leads to a new form of the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_t \;=\; -\frac{1}{2}(\Delta_1+\Delta_2) \;-\; \frac{1}{r_1} \;-\; \frac{1}{r_2} \;+\; \frac{\lambda}{r_{12}}\;, \quad \lambda=\frac{1}{Z}\;, \tag{2}$$

where the new energy $\tilde{E}(\lambda)=\frac{E(Z)}{Z^2}$. We will use atomic units throughout omitting dimensions.

One of the important tools to study the spectra of (1), proposed in the early days of quantum mechanics, is to develop the perturbation theory in (2) in powers of $\frac{1}{Z}$ constructing the expansion of $\tilde{E}$ [1],

$$\tilde{E} \;=\; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e_n\lambda^n\;. \tag{3}$$

This is the celebrated $1/Z$-expansion. The main reason for the interest in the $1/Z$-expansion comes from the point of view of theory: it is among very few convergent(!) expansions in quantum physics – its convergence was proved rigorously by Kato [2]. It is considered as a challenge to find its radius of convergence λ_* and the asymptotic behavior of coefficients $e_n$at $n\to\infty$. In this paper we will consider the expansion (3) for the ground state only.

The first two coefficients in (3) are found analytically, $e_0=-1, e_1=\frac{5}{8}$. The first attempt to calculate the next three coefficients was carried out by Hylleraas [1]. Then many workers dedicated considerable efforts to find as many of these coefficients as possible with the highest possible accuracy (see [3] and [4] where extensive discussion with extended bibliography and historical account is presented) hoping to deduce the radius of convergence. A culmination of this story happened at 1990 when Baker et al. [4] computed as many as ~ 401 coefficients of $1/Z$-expansion (3) essentially overpassing all previous calculations in both accuracy and the number of coefficients.

Many years ago F. Stillinger [5] presented arguments that $\lambda_*>1/Z_{cr}$ - the inverse critical charge for which the system $(Z,2e)$ at $Z<Z_{cr}$ gets unbound, thus, $\tilde{E}(Z_{cr})=-\frac{1}{2}$ and the ionization energy is equal to zero. Later this statement was challenged by W. Reinhardt [6] who conjectured that based on a possible dilatation analyticity of the problem the radius of convergence coincides with the inverse critical charge $\lambda_*=1/Z_{cr}$ and that there exists a singularity at real $\lambda=\lambda_*$ (see for discussion [4] and references therein).

We are not aware of any further calculations of the $1/Z$-expansion coefficients performed after the paper of Baker et al, [4] was published, for the next twenty years. In 2010 the results of [4] were challenged in [7]. In [7] it was shown that the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients e_n at $n \to \infty$ derived from the analysis of the coefficients e_n, taken from $n = 13$ to $n = 19$, differs from one obtained from the analysis of the coefficients e_n taken from $n = 25$ to $n = 401$ [4]. It leads to a significant deviation at large n coefficients, e.g. at $n = 200$ the discrepancy in the leading significant digit is about 50% (while e_{200} is itself of the order 10^{-16}, see e.g. Table II in [8]). In [8] this result was considered as an indication that the computational accuracy in [4] is exaggerated, in particular, the quadruple precision arithmetics either did not work or might be insufficient, at least, for the calculation of the first significant digits in the highest order coefficients. From another side, in [9] it was indicated that the sum of printed e_n-coefficients in [4] does not correspond to the number, which was reported, in the 13-15 decimal digits. It was also shown that making a phenomenological analysis by fitting the coefficients e_{2-6} allows us to reproduce the ground state energies for $Z = 1 - 10$ found accurately in [10] with 14 decimal digits. Those fitted coefficients e_{2-6} coincided with ones from [4] in 12 decimal digits but usually differed in all others. In particular, it was shown that in e_2 the first 13 decimal digits obtained in the fit coincide with ones printed in [4], when the 14th decimal digit obtained in the fit should be 5 instead of 4. All the above was considered as an indication that e_n-coefficients found in [4] are doubtful beyond 12 decimal digits.

Note that in [8], a terminated Puiseux expansion (in fractional degrees) was also constructed as a high accuracy interpolation of the ground state energy close and above the critical charge Z_{cr}. It was shown that the Puiseux expansion contains (with high accuracy) the integer and half-integer degrees (exponents) and the asymptotic behavior of the e_n coefficients derived from that expansion is incompatible with the asymptotic behavior found in [4]. Also it was demonstrated that the critical charge λ_* derived from the Puiseux expansion differs in the third decimal digit from one found variationally in [4] (and recently, in [12]).

The main goal of this paper is to check compatibility of the ground state energies at $Z = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, 10$ found perturbatively using partial sums (3) with the coefficients e_n obtained (and printed) in [4], with highly accurate results for the ground state energies of two-electron ions obtained in [10]. It will allow us to check constructively a validity of the Kato theorem about finiteness of the radius of convergence of the $1/Z$-expansion. In particular, we want

to calculate the ground state energies at $Z = 11, 12$ perturbatively, and with a maximal accuracy improving the results long ago known in literature [11]. A realization of this goal implies a critical analysis of known $1/Z$-expansion coefficients collected and printed in [4]. Another goal is to make a perturbative calculation of the threshold energy E_{th} which corresponds to the critical charge, *i.e.* for which the ionization energy vanishes. Our third goal is to try to construct a terminated Puiseux expansion with integer and half-integer degrees assuming a presence of a singularity at the critical charge *exactly* (reliably calculated in [12]). All calculations are going to be cross-checked in two different multiple precision arithmetics: (i) Intel ifort q-precision real*16 (quadruple precision) and (ii) Maple Digits=30 in Maple 13.

We begin our presentation from a critical analysis of the $1/Z$-expansion coefficients e_n collected and printed in [4] indicating three numerically incorrect statements.

(I). The first observation is that we do not confirm the statement from [4] (p.1254) (see [9]):

The sum of the e_n's for n running from 0 to 401 is

$$-\,0.527\,751\,016\,544\,266 \tag{4}$$

which, at the time we did our calculations, was the most accurate estimate of the energy for the ground state of H^-. Our own result of summation using e_n printed in [4], Table III with ten significant figures (eventually presented with , at least, 12 decimals and sometimes with even more decimals) [16]

$$-0.527\,751\,016\,544\,160\ .$$

It differs in the last three decimal digits. It gives us a reason to suspect that either the quadruple precision arithmetics used by the authors of [4] was insufficient due to of error accumulation, or the length of the trial function expansion (476 basis functions) was not enough, or both factors together, prevent going beyond 12 decimal digits (or non-printed decimals which we put equal to zero are essential, see below a discussion). Thus, we can not trust decimal digits beyond 12th in coefficients e_n. In particular, all e_n for $n > 135$ (when the (rounded) coefficients are of the order 10^{-12} and less, see [4], Table III) seem untrustable.

In conclusion, we have to note that both the above numbers for energy at $Z = 1$ coincide

up to 12 decimal digits with the accurate result obtained in [10]

$$-\,0.527\,751\,016\,544\,377\ (rounded) \tag{5}$$

but differ from it in 13th and subsequent decimal digits. It is the explicit indication that e_n (all or some) calculated in [4] beyond 12 decimal digits are not trustful. Furthermore, making a comparison of the numbers (4) and (5) one can draw a conclusion that the results obtained in [4] remain doubtful even if we assume that more significant figures in e_n were calculated but for whatever reason were not printed in [4] but were used to obtain the sum (4). In general, the result (4) contradicts the Kato's theorem on the convergence of the $1/Z$ expansion beyond twelve decimal digits.

(II). The second observation is that we do not confirm another statement from [4] (p.1254): *For $Z = 2$ the corresponding weighted sum of coefficients ... yields an estimate of*

$$-\,2.903\,724\,377\,034\,116\,7 \tag{6}$$

for the ground state energy of helium .... Our own result using e_n printed in [4] with ten significant figures, in general, but with, at least, 12 decimals (by adding zeroes afterwards, see footnote [16])

$$-2.903\,724\,377\,034\,051\,9 \quad (non-rounded)$$

differs in the last four decimal digits. We have to note that both the above numbers coincide up to 12 decimal digits (before rounding) with accurate result given in [10] for $Z = 2$

$$-\,2.903\,724\,377\,034\,119\,6\ (rounded) \tag{7}$$

Even if we assume that more significant figures in e_n were calculated but not printed in [4] the result (6) differs from (7) in the 15-16th decimal digits. This is one more indication (cf (I)) that e_n calculated in [4] beyond the 14th decimal digit are not trustful. In general, the result (6) contradicts the Kato's theorem on the convergence of the $1/Z$ expansion beyond fourteenth decimal digit.

Following the above observations (I) and (II) the number of trustable *significant* digits in e_n from [4] reduces gradually with increase of n and becomes for $e_{40,50}$ (where the first seven decimal digits are zeroes) equal to 5, out of 12 *decimal* digits. It leads to questioning the statement from [4] (p.1254):

(III). *The results ... suggest that even our higher order e_n's are accurate to a few parts in 10^{-5} and our high-order r_n's* (the ratio of subsequent coefficients) *to a few parts in 10^{-6}.*

It implies, in particular, that even the first significant digit in the coefficients e_n at $n > 135$ is not trustable. These coefficients form a great portion of data used for interpolation and eventually for the extraction of asymptotic behavior of coefficients e_n . Hence, the obtained asymptotic behavior in [4] is not fully trustable.

Keeping in mind the observations (I)-(III) we take the coefficients e_n printed in [4] (see Table III therein) and calculate the partial weighted sum of (3) up to $n = 401$ for $Z = 1 \dots 10$. We obtain an agreement between the energies found perturbatively using the partial sum in

Z	E (a.u.) from (3)	E (a.u.)
Z_{cr}^{EBMD}	-0.414 986 047	-0.414 986 212 532 679
	-0.414 978 381 (∗)	-0.414 986 212 53 [13]
1	-0.527 751 016 544 (2)	-0.527 751 016 544 377
	-0.527 751 016 471 (∗)	
2	-2.903 724 377 034 (1)	-2.903 724 377 034 119
3	-7.279 913 412 669 (3)	-7.279 913 412 669 305
4	-13.655 566 238 423 (6)	-13.655 566 238 423 586
5	-22.030 971 580 242 (8)	-22.030 971 580 242 781
6	-32.406 246 601 898 (5)	-32.406 246 601 898 530
7	-44.781 445 148 772 (7)	-44.781 445 148 772 704
8	-59.156 595 122 757 (9)	-59.156 595 122 757 925
9	-75.531 712 363 959 (5)	-75.531 712 363 959 491
10	-93.906 806 515 037 (5)	-93.906 806 515 037 549
11	-114.281 883 776 072 (7)	-114.281 879 (∗∗)
12	-136.656 948 312 646 (9)	-136.656 944 (∗∗)

TABLE I: Perturbative Theory energies $E(Z)$ from (3) with coefficients $e_n, n = 0, 1, \dots 401$ from [4], (∗) with reduced # of decimal digits to 12 (see text). Energies E (rounded, right column) at the threshold, for $Z = 1$ (see text), from Ref. [10] for $Z > 1$; the results [11] marked by (∗∗)

(3) and the ones in [10] for all $Z = 1 \dots 10$: they coincide up to 12, sometimes, 13 decimal

digits, see Table I. Since the contribution of the higher order coefficients into the weighted sum (3) to the ground state energy decreases dramatically with the increase of the charge Z, it is guaranteed that the same number 12 of correct decimal digits, at least, should be obtained for larger $Z > 10$. Based on that, the ground state energies for two-electron ions $Z = 11$ (Na^{9+}) and $Z = 12$ (Mg^{10+}) are calculated perturbatively and presented in Table I. They improve the most accurate results obtained in [11]: they differ from them in the sixth decimal digit. However, for $Z = 1$ the agreement between the energy found perturbatively through (3) and the one from [10] occurs up to the 12th decimal digit (before rounding). We made an experiment by rounding the coefficients e_n from [4] to 12 decimals. It implies, in particular, that all coefficients $e_n = 0$, for $n > 135$. Then we calculated the weighted sums (3) for different Z. For $Z = 2, \ldots, 12$ the results for weighted sums remain essentially unchanged up to 12 decimals, see Table I, sometimes making a difference in one portion of 10^{-12}. It implies that, in fact, decimals beyond 12th in e_n do not give a contribution to the first 12 decimal digits in ground state energies for $Z = 2, \ldots, 12$. However, for $Z = 1$ the situation becomes different: the sum is increased in such a way that a coincidence with the energy of [10] occurs up to the 10th decimal digit (after rounding) only, see Table I. This can be considered as an indication to incorrectly calculated decimal digits in [4] in the first coefficients e_n and, perhaps, for $e_n, n > n_0$ beyond the first 10th decimals(!), where n_0 is some integer. It is certainly the indication that e_n-coefficients should be checked/recalculated beyond ten decimal digits in order to get an agreement with the energy found in [10] for $Z = 1$.

Recently, Estienne et al. [12] (EBMD) in a remarkable, high precision variational calculation with triple basis sets containing up to 2276 terms, obtained a highly accurate value for the critical charge

$$Z_{cr}^{EBMD} \;=\; 0.911\,028\,224\,077\,255\,73\,, \tag{8}$$

and for the linear slope of $E(\lambda)$ at the critical charge, 0.2451890639. This result (8) coincides in 5 decimals with the one from [4] and in 3 decimals with the one from [8] (after rounding). In spite of the Reinhardt conjecture claim that the $1/Z$ expansion diverges at Z_{cr} we calculated the weighted sum (3) for such a critical charge using the coefficients from [4], see Table I. Surprisingly, this result when compared with the exact energy at threshold,

$$E_{th} = -\frac{(Z_{cr}^{EBMD})^2}{2}\,, \tag{9}$$

leads to a difference $\sim 10^{-7}$. The remainder in (3) is

$$\frac{e_{401}}{Z_{cr}^{401}} \ \sim \ -2 \times 10^{-9} \ .$$

It indicates that the singularity at Z_{cr}, if it exists, is pretty "weak". Recently, the value of the critical charge (8) was calculated in a direct solution of the Schroedinger equation for the Hamiltonian (1) using the Lagrange-mesh method [13]. It was found that for $Z = Z_{cr}^{EBMD}$ the lowest eigenvalue coincides with threshold energy E_{th} in 12 decimal digits. That corresponds to the ionization energy $\sim 10^{-12}$. Thus, twelve decimals in Z_{cr}^{EBMD} have been verified in an independent calculation.

With accurate knowledge of the critical charge (8) and linear slope of $E(\lambda)$ at the critical charge [12] (predicted in [14]) one can make the analysis of the behavior of the ground state energy $\tilde{E}(\lambda)$ in the vicinity of the inverse critical charge at $\lambda \leq \lambda_{cr}$ fitting $\tilde{E}(\lambda)$ via the terminated Puiseux expansion with integer and half-integer exponents (c.f. [8]). This time it is the interpolation of the energy $E(Z)/Z^2$ at eight points including the critical charge, $Z \in [Z_{cr}^{EBMD}, 0.95, 1., 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2, 1.25]$ taking the energies for $Z > Z_{cr}^{EBMD}$ calculated in [8] , [17] . This leads to the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}^{(fit)}(\lambda) \ &= \ -\frac{1}{2} - 0.2451890639 \ \tilde{\lambda} - 0.0252309 \ \tilde{\lambda}^{3/2} - 0.5532438 \ \tilde{\lambda}^2 \\ &\quad + 0.9729112 \ \tilde{\lambda}^{5/2} - 0.707285 \ \tilde{\lambda}^3 \ + \dots \ , \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

(c.f. [8]), where $\tilde{\lambda} = (\lambda_{cr}^{EBMD} - \lambda)$ and $\lambda_{cr}^{EBMD} = 1.09766083373855980$ [12]. The expression (10) reproduces 7-6 s.d. in energies at Z close to the critical charge, then gradually deteriorates with the increase in Z giving 3 s.d. at $Z = 1.25$; for illustration see Table II. This fit is not of a good quality: the coefficients are large in front of terms of larger degrees; they do not demonstrate a tendency to converge. The coefficient in front of $\tilde{\lambda}^{3/2}$ is rather small compared to other coefficients. Probably, it can vanish if we would reduce the interval of interpolation from $[Z_{cr}^{EBMD}, 1.35]$ to say $[Z_{cr}^{EBMD}, 0.95]$. It seems as an important check of viability of the expansion (10): since we do not know the radius of convergence of the Puiseux expansion, we do not know a domain in Z to choose for interpolation. In order to realize this check, the calculations of energies in this domain should be done in a method other than the Korobov basis set used in [8] (see also footnote [17]), for example, in the Lagrange mesh method [13] or in triple basis set [12]. This will be done elsewhere.

To conclude, we state that the use of the e_n-coefficients found by Baker et al. in the weighted sum (3) allow us to reproduce up to 12 decimals in the exact ground state energies

Z	E	$E^{(fit)}$
1.3	-0.609 406 309	-0.609 9
1.25	-0.597 488 174	-0.597 7
1.15	-0.571 655 437	-0.571 68
1.00	-0.527 751 017	-0.527 751 009
0.95	-0.512 049 529	-0.512 049 511

TABLE II: Ground state energy E for two-electron ion for selected values of Z found in [8] and with the correction for $Z = 0.95$ for the sixth and next decimals, see [13]; here all the displayed digits are assumed to be correct, $E^{(fit)}$ from the fit (10).

for $Z = 1, \ldots 10$. In a way it confirms constructively the validity of theorem by Kato about a finite radius of convergence of $1/Z$ expansion on the level of 10 decimal digits and rules out the existence of exponentially-small terms $\sim \exp(-a|Z|^{\alpha})$ with parameters $a > 0, \alpha \geq 1$. Since we have no doubts in validity of the Kato theorem, it indicates that the e_n-coefficients found by Baker et al. have to be recalculated to check the validity of their higher digits, beyond 10 decimal figures. Note that if the Feynman diagram technique for calculations of e_n can be established which seems plausible, one could expect to have e_n in a form of superposition of Riemann ζ-functions with integer arguments.

We feel a necessity to develop an alternative, analytical approach for finding the asymptotic behavior of e_n-coefficients, probably, similar to one based on dispersion relations in a coupling constant for anharmonic oscillators due to Bender and Wu [15], or one derived directly from a path integral as it is done in quantum field theory. A separate issue is to find the level crossings in the λ-complex plane and associated square-root branch points, especially, closest (and close) to λ_{cr}, $\lambda = 0$, and its respective contributions to the e_n coefficients. This might be the subject of a future work.

The low quality of the interpolation of the behavior of $E(\lambda)$ near λ_{cr} using a finite number of terms in the Puiseux expansion with integer and half-integer degrees at $\lambda = \lambda_{cr}$ might be either an indication to the absence of a singularity at λ_{cr} and terms of fractional degrees in the Puiseux expansion, or, at least, to a small radius of convergence of the Puiseux expansion. This question should be studied more carefully, in particular, from a numerical point of view. Without addressing above issues the validity of the Reinhardt conjecture can

not be established.

The research is supported in part by DGAPA grants IN109512, IN108815 (Mexico). The authors are thankful to the participants of the seminars at IIMAS-UNAM (Mexico), AMO at University of Stony Brook and University of Connecticut, ITAMP (Harvard) for interest to work and useful remarks.

---

[1] E.A. Hylleraas, *Z.Phys.* **65**, (1930) 209-225

[2] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*,
2nd edition, Springer: New York p.410-413

[3] J.N. Silverman, *Phys. Rev.* **A23**, 441 (1981)

[4] J.D. Baker, D.E. Freund, R.N. Hill, J.D. Morgan III, *Phys. Rev.* **A41**, 1247 (1990)

[5] F.H. Stillinger, *J. Chem. Phys.* **45**, 3623 - 3631 (1966);
F.H. Stillinger, D.K. Stillinger, *Phys. Rev.* **10**, 1109 (1974)

[6] W.P. Reinhardt, *Phys. Rev.* **A15** (1977) 802 - 805

[7] J. Zamastil, J. Cizek, L. Skala, M. Simanek, *Phys. Rev.* **A81** (2010) 032118

[8] A.V. Turbiner, N.L. Guevara, *Phys Rev* **A84** (2011) 064501 (4pp)

[9] J.C.Lopez Vieyra, A.V. Turbiner,
On $1/Z$ *expansion for two electron system (Comment on "Radius of convergence and analytic behavior of the* $1/Z$ *expansion" by Baker et al 1990)*
Arxiv: 1309.4810 (September 2013), 6pp

[10] H. Nakashima, H. Nakatsuji, *J. Chem. Phys.* **127**, 224104 (2007)

[11] A.J. Thakkar, V.H. Smith, Jr. *Phys. Rev.* **A15**, 1-15 (1977)

[12] C.S. Estienne, M. Busuttil, A. Moini, G.W.F. Drake,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 173001 (2014)

[13] H.Olivares-Pilon, A.V. Turbiner,
Physics Letters A **379** (2015) 688-690

[14] B. Simon,
J. Functional Anal. **25**, 338-344 (1977)

[15] C.M. Bender, T.T. Wu,
Phys. Rev. **184**, 1231 (1969);

Phys. Rev. **D 7**, 1620 (1973)

[16] We added zeroes afterwards to have a total of 15 decimals in each coefficient. Those digits were neither printed nor mentioned in [4], but needed for consistency in order to get 15 decimal digits in the sum (3), in order to compare it with the one printed in (4)

[17] Note that the ground state energies were calculated in [8] using the Korobov basis set of a size which leads to twelve correct significant figures in the energy for H^-, at $Z = 1$. However, it does not guarantee the same number of correct significant figures in energy for smaller $Z < 1$. Furthemore, it was shown in [13] that the accuracy deteriorates dramatically: for $Z = 0.95$ the accuracy drops to one portion 10^{-7}(!) while for $Z > 1$ it remains equally accurate as for $Z = 1$. Since we do not require our fit to reproduce more than 6-7 decimals, this deficiency at $Z = 0.95$ does not really hurt us.